

<i>Interview Summary</i>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/120,117 Examiner James Mitchell	MEZAWA, TSUTOMU Art Unit 2827

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) James Mitchell. (3) _____.

(2) Sam Huang. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 01 August 2003.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: _____.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.



Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant inquired about inconsistency of drawing review in notice of allowability. In the notice, examiner indicated that drawings were both accepted and required corrected drawings. Examiner stated that the changes required by draftsman were correct and that a supplemental notice of allowability would be forwarded to applicant. Because applicant indicated that he did not have a record of the required draftsman correction, examiner faxed a copy of the draftsman correction to applicant. Applicant confirmed that it had received the draftsman correction. Per applicant's request, a copy of the signed IDS filed October 12, 2000 will also be forwarded.